REMARKS

Introduction

Claims 1, 7, and 8-15, and 17-29 were pending. Claims 1 and 7 are independent. Claims 1 and 7 have been amended. Claims 22, 23 and 29 have been cancelled.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as allegedly being indefinite for referring to the trademark "Java Script". By this Amendment, the rejection is moot in light of the cancellation of claim 22.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 7, 13-15, and 17-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,772,031 (Strand) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,805 (Acker et al.) in view of NNRD435152 "Bloodhound Server Monitor Package" (IBM).

Strand discloses a graphical user interface for monitoring a job executing on a remote host system from a local workstation by displaying a tree view of the system, a (job) queue within the system, a job within the queue, and a file (dataset) related to the job. The graphical user interface displays the tree view; displays a first level of the tree, the first level comprising one or more system nodes, each system node representing a host system; displays a second level of the tree, the second level comprising one or more job queue nodes, each job queue node branching below a system node representing a job queue in the host system corresponding to the system node; and displays a third level of the tree, the third level comprising one or more job nodes, each job node branching below a job queue node representing a job in the job queue corresponding to the job queue node.

In contrast, the present invention as claimed in amended independent claims 1 and 7, describes a method and system for receiving a query regarding status of one or more queue managers and including a server name at a tree renderer located on an application server which includes a queue manager bean and a queue bean, the queue manager bean acting as a container to store a list of queue managers, the queue bean acting as a container to store a list of queues; sending a message containing the server name to the queue manager bean from the tree renderer; sending a message from the queue manager bean to select the server corresponding to the named server to one of the plurality message servers; receiving and storing the list of queue managers from the one of the plurality of message servers at the queue manager bean; providing the list of queues managers to the tree renderer by the queue manager bean; processing the list of queues managers into a tree structure by the tree renderer; receiving a query regarding status of one or more queues and including a queue manager name from the list of queue managers at the tree renderer; sending a message from the queue bean to retrieve a list of queues corresponding to the named queue manager to one of the plurality of message servers on multiple platforms; receiving and storing the list of queues from the one of a plurality of message servers at the queue bean; providing the list of queues to the tree renderer by the queue bean; processing the list of queues into the tree structure by the tree renderer; and delivering the tree structure to a user in a web browser on a display.

The Examiner points to FIG. 6 as disclosing the system name of a system node, job queues retrieved under that system node, jobs within each job queue, and data set (files) for each job. Applicants submit that there is not a one-to-one correspondence between the system/method of amended claims 1 and 7 and the system/method of Strand. The System node name of Strand may correspond to the server name of amended claims 1 and 7, however, there is nothing in Strand which corresponds to the system node name being used for obtaining a list of

queue managers using a queue manager bean as described in amended independent claim 1 and 7. The Examiner refers to FIG. 4 and FIG. 6 as disclosing obtaining a list of queue managers, wherein sending in the system name "causes information about the number of queues, i.e. the manager of each of the jobs, which are queues because they contain list of items, i.e., the datasets" as reading on original claims 23 and 29, which have now been incorporated into amended claims 1 and 7, respectively. In the context of FIGS. 4 and 6, sending the system name retrieves a list of job queues, not a list of job queue managers, each of which manages a list of queues. The method/system of claims 1 and 7 describe a higher level of list, namely the list of queue managers. The list of job queues of FIG. 4 and 6 of Strand correspond to the list of queues of amended claims 1 and 7, and the jobs of Strand correspond to the messages of claims 20 and 27 of the present invention. The Examiner points to Steps 635, 640, and 645 or steps 620, 625, and 630 of FIG. 6 as describing a list of messages as claimed in claims 20 and 27 of the present invention. Applicants assert that while steps 620, 625, and 630 correspond to a list of messages within a given queue, there is nothing in the present invention corresponding to references 635, 640, and 645, which correspond to data or files associated with each message in a queue. The job (message) and job data are not one in the same.

While the Examiner admits that queues are not managed by beans, the Examiner asserts that Acker et al. discloses managing queues with beans. Applicants disagree with the Examiner's assertion as Acker et al. fails to cure the deficiencies of Strand. Acker et al. discloses a stateful EJB session bean used as the front end to client calls. In this configuration, a queue is represented by a session bean instance. "Put" and "get" are called on the relevant session bean instances. Thus, for example, a client, instead of first finding a home for a given type of OMs then calling "put" on the home to send out messages, will find a session bean home, create a session bean instance corresponding to a queue, and call "put" on the bean instance to send

messages. In this manner, the message queue can be managed using standard EJB techniques. The management of queues as disclosed by Acker et al. is fundamentally different from the management of queues of amended independent claims 1 and 7. The EJBeans of Acker et al. stand in as proxies for direct management of queues, where one "gets" and "puts" individual messages into the EJBean acting as a queue itself. In contrast, the queue manager bean of amended independent claims 1 and 7 retrieves and stores a list of queue managers, and the queue bean retrieves and stores a list of queues. There is no concept of getting and putting messages as if the beans were the queues themselves. The beans of amended claims 1 and 7 are merely containers for storing and retrieving lists, not managing queue-like data structures.

IBM fails to correct the deficiencies of Strand and Acker et al. As cited by the Examiner, IBM describes using a web browser to access a network monitoring program. There is no mention of selecting a queue manager, nor sending a message for querying queue status to an object like the tree renderer which itself performs the task of retrieving the list of queues from a queue bean and then renders the list into a tree structure. There is no mention of a queue manager bean which selects a server responsible for managing a list of queue managers, nor mention of a queue bean which selects the queue manager responsible for managing a list of queues and then storing the list in the queue bean. There is no mention of how queue data is obtained from a queue manager and sorted into a hierarchical structure.

As such, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on Strand in view of Acker et al. in view of IBM is requested.

Each of pending claims 17-21 ultimately depend from claim 1, and each of pending claims 8, 9, 13-15 and new claims 24-28 ultimately depend from claim 7. Dependent claims 8, 9, 13-15, 17-21, and claims 24-28 are deemed to be patentable over Strand in view of

Acker et al. in view of IBM, for at least the reasons described above with respect to the patentability of claims 1 and 7.

Thus, Applicants submits that each of the claims of the present application are patentable over each of the references of record, either taken alone, or in any proposed hypothetical combination. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections to the claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the present application is respectfully requested. If any fees are deemed necessary for this Amendment to be entered and considered by the Examiner, then the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fee to Deposit Account No. 50-1358. Applicant's undersigned patent agent may be reached by telephone at (973) 597-2500. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 1/7/2008

Raymond G. Cappo
Patent Agent for Applicant
Registration No. 53,836

DOCKET ADMINISTRATOR
LOWENSTEIN SANDLER PC
65 Livingston Avenue
Roseland, NJ 07068